DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 242 701 SP 024 105

AUTHOR Hill, John P.
TITLE Participatory Education and Youth Development in Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescent Development; Decision Making Skills; *Experiential Learning; *Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Secondary Education; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; Student Participation; Student Responsibility; Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

Effective participatory education programs are planned efforts designed to effect cognitive, social, and affective change. Although research does not yet permit unequivocal generalizations about effects, existing research is promising, especially when compared with research on effects of work experience per se. Positive effects include student, teacher, and community supervisor enthusiasm, feelings of self-efficacy and social efficacy, and increased knowledge about the domain in which the experience occurs. Assuring effective programs appears to depend most upon: (1) clarifying and prioritizing objectives; (2) communicating objectives and priorities to all concerned; (3) adapting and localizing successful efforts of others; (4) providing adequate time for planning and pilot efforts; (5) providing resources to impart knowledge and skills to school and community-based facilitators; (6) providing follow-through; (7) involving young people in serious working relationships with adults and peers; (8) designing programs to respond to genuine needs; (9) mounting efforts with visible results; (10) including opportunities for serious analysis and reflection; (11) providing "hands-on" experience and skill-training keyed to student needs and abilities; and (12) assessing student progress flexibly. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED242701

RBS Publications

PARTICIPATORY EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

John P. Hill
Virginia Commonwealth University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Marian L. Chapman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.
444 NORTH THIRD STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19123

SP024105

PARTICIPATORY EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

John P. Hill
Virginia Commonwealth University

Urban Development Component
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19123

1983

This work upon which this publication is based was funded by the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

Editor.....Michele A. Woods
Senior Secretary/Word Processing Operator.....Lorraine E. Bailey

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
OVERVIEW	2
BACKGROUND	6
LITERATURE SURVEY	9
Descriptive Research	9
Theoretical Bases	9
"Process" Research	12
Outcome Research	14
National Leadership Conference (NLC)	14
The Evaluation of the Experiential Learning Project	15
The Better Education Through Application (BETA) Project	18
Experienced-Based Career Education (EBCE) Programs	19
The Greenberger and Steinberg Study of Work in "Naturally Occurring" Part-Time Jobs	22
Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project (YIEPP)	24
AUTHOR's COMMENTARY ON LITERATURE	24
Participant Reports	25
Evidence from External Sources	25
Attributing Effects to Programs	26
Attributing Particular Effects to Particular Properties of Programs	26
ISSUES	28
Clarification of the Concept of Participatory Education	28
"Participation Programs are Noncognitive; Classroom Programs are Cognitive	29
Youth Participation Amounts to Letting Students Leave the School Grounds to Experience the "Real World"	29
We Can't Do Outward Bound in Kansas Because There Are No Mountains	30
The Role of Participatory Education in Secondary Schools	31
RECOMMENDATIONS	33
SUMMARY	42
REFERENCES	44

PARTICIPATORY EDUCATION AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS*

The past 10 to 15 years have seen renewed attention to the second decade of life in all disciplines and domains of service and research that bear upon health, education, welfare, and citizenship. At the core of these contemporary efforts to reassess adolescence is "the extent to which we permit entry into the institutions of society for young people for purposes of their socialization" (Hill & Monks, 1977, p. 2). This paper considers the nature, circumstances, and consequences of participatory educational experiences for young people. Such consideration is warranted as part of the general reassessment of what makes for effective secondary schools in light of today's declining national youth population and limited or zero growth school budgets. Many youth participation efforts were launched in times that were both more expansive and more turbulent than the present. Some programs were truly innovative and set standards for teaching and learning that would be admired by virtually any educator. Other programs were devised in response to immediate social and political pressures--sometimes with more enthusiasm than could be matched with quality control. Those times have passed. There now is some research and reflective opinion about participatory education. It is timely to reconsider the issues outside the context of protest, panic, and panacea with the results of over a decade of experience and scholarship in mind.

---

*A position paper prepared for Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1983. I am grateful for the helpful assistance given me by Thomas V. McGovern, Judith Erickson, Diane Hedin, Joan Scheff Lipstiz, and Stephen F. Hamilton in its preparation. The present effort would have been much more difficult were it not for excellent reviews by Conrad and Hedin (1982) and Hamilton (1980).

Overview

Hamilton (1980) offered one of the most serviceable definitions of participatory education, although he preferred to call it experiential learning:

> ..."experiential learning" will refer to educational programs functioning outside of conventional school classrcoms that place participants in responsible roles and engage them in cooperative goal-directed activities with other youth, with adults, or both. It is synonymous or closely related to such terms as 'action learning' [National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1972], youth participation [Heyneman & Thomas, 1977], youth involvement [Weber & Custer, 1970], and work experience [Searcy, 1973] (p. 180).

The diversity of participatory education programs is immense and the activities within them even more so. The following list describes this diversity:

- as part of a service-unit in a biology class, students work in a food co-op serving a low-income area (cited in Agnew, 1982);
- in an American government course, students conduct opinion polls of citizens on issues before city government (cited in Agnew, 1982);
- drafting and journalism students produce user-guides for the city park system, emphasizing facilities for the handicapped (cited in Agnew, 1982);
- alternative school students develop, produce, and distribute videotapes dealing with youth and youth-related issues and lead discussions about them in community groups (cited in Tyler, 1982);
- male high school students provide health screening and health information to their peers and other community members, including screening for venereal diseases, dental screening, testing for blood pressure and the like (cited in Tyler, 1982);
- alternative school students run a consumer action service which involves them in day-to-day consumer advocacy interactions with industrial and service organizations and public and private agencies (cited in Brannan & Nathan, 1982); and
- young people volunteer in child care centers and in nursing homes (cited in Shoup, 1982).

Youth participation programs have generally been classified according to student activities and roles. Conrad and Hedin (1977), for example, identified five forms of school-sponsored citizen participation programs: voluntary service in social agencies, community projects, social-political action, community study, and internships. In its New Roles for Youth, the National Commission on Resources for Youth (1974) described programs in which young people acted as curriculum builders, teachers, community workers, entrepreneurs, community problem solvers, communicators, or resource people for other youths. Such categories are useful in describing the range and diversity of youth participation activities, but they tend to overemphasize--if taken as the sole basis for categorization--the activities or roles themselves rather than highlight dimensions that make the activities and roles educationally meaningful.

Hamilton (1980) identified six characteristics according to which participatory education programs can be sorted, all of which define participation as not merely "doing things" but doing them where certain conditions of teaching and learning apply. The six characteristics are: activity, sponsorship, control, participation, leadership, and purpose. Activity classifications have already been illustrated above. Sponsorship highlights the notion that organizations other than schools sponsor youth participation. According to Hamilton, the most important aspect of sponsorship is "the extent to which experiential learning is articulated with classroom learning, whether sponsored by a school or by another youth organization, or even an adult organization" (1980, p. 192). Control speaks directly to the opportunities the program provides for young people to exercise initiative and control. Participation generally but not

always means voluntary participation, with less emphasis on whether the program was started by youth or adults and more on the opportunities given students to enter into decision making. Leadership, or staffing, obviously is tied to control but refers to the character of adult leaders, above and beyond the power they exercise. Indeed, Hamilton considers it the most critical of all of the dimensions in determining the quality of programs. A dimension useful in characterizing programs, participation, is, as will be seen below, often ignored by planners and policy-setters when discussing youth participation. Often programs are planned with the objective of fostering interaction among youths of diverse backgrounds and experiences. Sometimes programs are targeted toward specified groups. Very often, it appears to be assumed, implicitly, that what might be "good" for middle-class males is standard for the program. Another dimension, purpose, requires more lengthy treatment. Because participatory programs can serve many objectives, program planners need to be especially clear about which objectives are at the core of their efforts. This not only helps them shape their activities and evaluations but also helps in communicating their educational intent to important constituencies effectively. Many participatory programs die because more notice is taken of externally obvious aspects of an activity than of its intended benefits. For example, installing a nature trail for the physically handicapped in a public park may not seem to be a suitable activity for a civics class until it is made clear to all that the focus of the learning involved is how things get accomplished in the local government structure.

Below is a list of some commonly voiced objectives of participatory programs. Not all of them will appeal to any one practitioner or educational policy maker; nor do all of them apply to a given activity within the program. Nevertheless, they do illustrate the array of objectives that are possible. These objectives are:

- o to complement conventional classroom opportunities for exploration of interests and abilities;
- o to enhance motivation for learning in more conventionally structured teaching and learning situations;
- o to increase understanding of the world of work and, thereby, to increase appreciation of the match between vocational possibilities and individual attributes;
- o to foster the development of personal initiative and responsibility;
- o to nurture cognitive development (e.g., in the same sense as laboratories are presumed to do in the physical sciences);
- o to promote inter-group understanding;
- o to cultivate the capacity to enjoy life (e.g., to build an appreciation for the rewarding use of leisure time beyond watching television);
- o to induce pride in, loyalty, and commitment to a school (and, therefore, perhaps to reduce absenteeism, alienation, and anonymity; destruction or defacing of property; bullying, theft, and violence); and
- o to respond, institutionally, to the vast, and normal range of biological and socio-psychological growth differences in the adolescent population in ways that grade- and age-determined, lock-step practices cannot easily accommodate.

In terms of more specific learning objectives, Hamilton's (1980) summary of purposes is well-worth repeating:

> ...the purpose of experiential learning should be to foster youth development in ways that classroom learning is not well suited for...Experiential learning should be viewed as complementary to classroom learning. Its objectives should be to increase the competence of youth in such arenas as planning, funding, and making use of appropriate resources; persistence at a task; coping with new ideas, conflicting opinions, and people who are different; taking

responsibility for others' welfare; and carrying out commitments to others (p. 191).

The perspective that guides the consideration of participation in this paper is, at its most general level, that of a developmental social psychologist with a principal interest in adolescent social development (Hill, 1980) and a secondary interest in the roles schools play in facilitating such development (Hill, 1982b). Research on adolescence has increased in all disciplines over the past decade (Hill, 1982a) and the cumulative result has been a consensus that adolescence is not universally a period of storm and stress. Moreover, it is now commonly accepted that the development of intensified relationships with peers does not normally mean that affectional ties with parents break down, that adolescents' values on important matters differ much from those of their parents, or that adolescents cease to seek advice and appreciate the standards of parents and other adults. Within most families, there has been little evidence of a generation gap. Rebelliousness is not normal in Western societies. There is no universal "identity crisis." In fact, the evidence strongly suggests that we could all do with a dedramatization of adolescence (Hill & Monks, 1977). This perspective is important in understanding "participation" because a view of adolescents as stressed, volatile, and oppositional directly affects the willingness of educators and others to place initiative and responsibility in the hands of teenagers.

Background

The reassessment of the state of our knowledge about adolescent development that began to occur in the research community in the early 1970s (Hill, 1973; Lipsitz, 1979; Dragastin & Elder, 1975; Hill & Monks,

1977) was paralleled by a series of reports on the state of American high schools (Brown, 1973; Coleman, 1974; Martin, 1974). Each of the "blue ribbon panels" responsible for these reports presented similar recommendations based upon similar assumptions. These assumptions focused on the presumed consequences of a nearly universal secondary education. Panelists argued that universal secondary education is accompanied by an increased segregation of adolescents from adults. Their reports implied that the peer group has gained in its power to socialize at the expense of both the family and the effectiveness of secondary schools. Peer effects on social development were assumed to be negative with respect to mainstream social values. Furthermore, age segregation and larger and more bureaucratic secondary schools were seen as increasing young people's alienation from the mainstream cultural tradition (a decline in the work ethic, for example). The reports assumed other effects as well, among them a massive generation gap and an increasing incapacity on the part of young people to assume adult roles as a result of the passive roles they are called upon to assume in most secondary schools. Suffice it to say that each of these assumptions, with the exception of the advent of universal secondary educations, is questionable.

It is interesting to note that the educational policy and planning recommendations that emerged from these assumptions bore heavily upon the question of participation. Aside from curricular change, panelists offered three kinds of recommendations: dispersion of educational efforts from the secondary school into the community and the marketplace; individualization and diversification of instruction; and greater participation of students and families in secondary school governance. At

the most general level, the concern was that schools do not educate for choice making in a pluralistic society because they do not permit students to make "real" choices and experience the consequences. Education for decision making in a diverse society, so the conclusions went, required exposure to diversity and to environments that permitted honest choice, without disastrous consequences, but consequences nonetheless.

The panels' recommendations reflected the experiences of panel members with programs already in place. Whether or not their reports instigated substantial new activity is difficult to tell. It appears more likely that the panels' investigations and the new level of interest in youth participation were both determined by the social and political forces in play at the time. Now, in the face of changing demographic trends and a diminution in the secondary school population, the absence of a youth movement pressing for institutional change, and faltering economic conditions and "no frills" attitudes, the impression is that there has been a slacking-off of interest, although this has not been documented.

It is also noteworthy that there is little documentation of the proportion of the adolescent population that has had access to innovative participation programs, let alone where that population is distributed with respect to urban and suburban residence and asscciated social and economic variables. It is my impression that participatory opportunities increased substantially for suburban and middle-class students in the 1960s and 1970s and that these opportunities have not accelerated, although they may be holding, at lower levels. It also appears that the more courageous and dramatic programs initiated in inner-city schools were implemented in pockets, but that they, too, have slacked-off.

Several colleagues with whom I have consulted in the preparation of this paper suggest that "slacking-off" is too weak a statement to be applied to participation. Some think that there is, in fact, a concerted effort to reduce participatory opportunities because a substantial number of secondary educators believe that participatory activities may have played a role in lowering achievement test scores. Underlying this attitude may be an assumption that participatory activities do not contribute to cognitive development, an assumption that will be addressed in the literature survey to follow.

Literature Survey

Several kinds of literature discuss issues in youth participation: program descriptions, including their rationale and informal analyses and evaluation; theoretical bases; analyses and empirical research on participatory processes; and research on outcomes per se.

Descriptive Research

Many of the fruits of descriptive research on participation have already been shared earlier in this paper and will not be repeated here. It is descriptive research that permitted the isolation of six characteristics of participatory programs and the enumeration of some program objectives.

Theoretical Bases

Although not a great many participatory programs are directly grounded in basic developmental theory, applicable theoretical formulations not only exist but have grown in scope during roughly the same time period as have participatory programs. These formulations emphasize the development of role-taking (coming to take the perspectives of others into

account) in social interaction and the impact of changes in role-taking skills on social behavior.

Although these arguments vary in detail and context, they may be characterized, in general, as follows. Roles that have demonstrable consequences to the individual and which expose the individual to mildly or moderately conflicting points of view, norms, or expectations facilitate the development of more sophisticated social understanding. First, they, facilitate the differentiation of one's perspective from that of others, thus combating adolescent egocentrism. Second, they promote the consideration of other perspectives along with one's own in approaching an issue or problem. Third, insofar as alternative perspectives cannot easily be acted upon without reference to some overreaching principle or value, responsible participation provides practice in balancing one's own perspective and those of others with the claims of applicable principles or ideologies. Fourth, coordinating such diverse perspectives develops a generalized societal perspective. As adolescents come to realize that their perspectives of the generalized expectations of the social structure are shared with others, communication processes should be enhanced and interpersonal and intergroup understanding increased. While the domain of application is social, the emphasis here is a manifestly cognitive one.

The most influential of such formulations is that of Piaget. Piaget argued that it is the transition to adult roles that instigates the transition into a new stage of thought, formal operations. Among the characteristics of formal operations is the capacity to take a variety of perspectives into account in solving a problem and to do so systematically, treating what is given as one of a number of possible instances but reasoning on the basis

of absent instances or "possibilities" as well (Inhelder & Piaget, 1958). When our reasoning involves abstract beliefs, principles, or hypotheses, we are reasoning on the basis of possibilities.

Piaget is not very specific about which aspects of adult roles moderate this transition--responsibility and commitment, complexity, or diversity of environmental demands. Coser (1975) has argued that diversity of expectations directed toward a given role-occupant enhances the development of autonomous thinking and decision-making capacities. Exposure to contradictory or incompatible expectations in a situation involving genuine responsibility and important consequences increases the need to deal with multiple perspectives. The process through which the individual deals with conflicting expectations encourages the development of autonomy. Effective reasoning requires evaluating different perspectives, setting priorities, and making decisions based upon knowledge of expectations. As Coser comments, "The attempt to integrate preferences, innovations, and compromises with what is socially legitimate is one of reflection and self-direction" (p. 246).

There is virtually no empirical research on adolescents that bears directly on these theoretical claims although they are consonant with research on moral development (Kohlberg, 1973), vocational choice (Borow, 1976), intimacy (Sharabany, Gershoni, & Hofman, 1981), and parent versus peer cross-pressures. What is more, "mature" outcomes for virtually all of the psychosocial tasks considered to be important during adolescence appear to require levels of cognitive sophistication of the sort sketched here.

"Process" Research

A full account of the research literature on how young people learn concepts, information, and skills in participatory programs would amount to a review of what we know about intellectual functioning and learning inside and outside of classrooms during the second decade of life--a task obviously well beyond the scope of the present paper. By including this category, I hope to underscore the point that the differences between teaching and learning in conventional classrooms and participatory programs have nothing to do with these programs' affective and motivational properties, their social properties, nor their cognitive properties. All conditions of teaching and learning are a mix of these three sets of attributes, whether the context is the conventional classroom or a "field" site. About the most egregious error made in the throes of advocating or denigrating participatory education efforts has been to deny their cognitive properties while, at the same time, declaiming their virtues or flaws in relation to affective motivational and social development. Effective youth participation programs imply not merely activities that provide a "high" nor that programs be shared with others to help ensure that the programs be maintained (even at a lower level); they imply intellectual effort and learning as well. It will suffice here to capsulize a few of the most thoughtful process-oriented contributions.

Coleman (1977) argues that learning in participatory programs may be contrasted with the "information assimilation" characteristic of conventional classroom programs on specific cognitive-process grounds. The first step is action, or the observation of action. The next step is derivation of a principle from the action. And, finally, the principle is applied to another

situation (generalization). While many programs probably do follow such a process, Hamilton (1980) pointed out, that other participatory programs for adolescents often begin with symbolic representations of events rather than action. It is only when participatory learning is contrasted with classroom learning, in general, that the relative balance tilts toward instrumental activity as the cognitive point of departure.

Newmann (1975) has also contributed to an increasingly sophisticated appreciation of the role of activity in participatory learning. He argues that it is easier to apply what participatory programs teach outside the classroom rather than inside. This is because application is part of the teaching and learning process. Outside the classroom, the objective is more often the outcome or, at least, the gap is less wide. His analogy is that of learning how to swim by swimming. The acquisition and the application are not so far apart.

Hamilton's (1980) review makes some important integrative contributions to questions of process. Beginning with the premise that all kinds of cognitive processes are involved in participatory learning programs, he asks "whether an experiential learning program is a more efficient and effective setting than a classroom for achieving certain educational objectives" (p. 194). He argues that three aspects of experiential learning may fit this bill: the substantiation of abstract concepts through concrete events (e.g., having the concept of separation of powers and then seeing a mayor and city council argue); immediacy of application (e.g., learning how to swim); and exploitation of intrinsic motivation (e.g., personal engagement instead of externally imposed rewards or sanctions). To this list of three, I would add a fourth

characteristic. Formal operation thinking across a number of domains is not characteristic of even a majority of secondary school students. Consequently, when a new domain and set of concepts are to be explored, participatory learning programs may well be more efficient and effective than conventional classroom programs.

Coleman (1977) points out two aspects of information processing where classroom learning is likely to be superior. Efficiency is one. As Hamilton points out, "It is difficult to conceive of an experiential learning program that would do a better job than most elementary school teachers do of teaching the multiplication tables" (p. 184). Generalization is another aspect of learning that may be more enhanced by classroom experience. The point is that symbolic learning predominates in the classroom and symbols are, by definition, general. Similarly, guided discussion and reflection appear to be essential to enhance generalization (and other cognitive and social benefits) and this is found more often in classroom programs (Coleman, 1977; Conrad & Hedin, 1982).

Outcome Research

This review of participatory education outcomes is illustrative and not comprehensive. It is designed to cover effects of several different kinds of programs. (Effects of non-school-connected work experience are included because they provide a useful perspective for evaluating school-related programs.) In addition, most of the literature on these programs is testimonial and anecdotal in nature. Here, research that extends beyond such efforts is stressed.

National Leadership Conference (NLC). This summer residential-camp program involves students in basic seminars, skill exploration, and an

intense immersion in 24- to 48-hour experiences around the camp and surrounding area. At the end of the program, there are two days for discussion and synthesis. Pre-post comparisons on a number of measures determine whether the objectives have been achieved. Over two years of evaluation (Conrad, 1982), students rated the program highly. NLC participants have indicated that they can have an impact on critical social problems and that they are confident of the power of groups to achieve important social ends. Gains for social as opposed to personal efficacy were the more impressive. Gains were reported on a Social and Personal Responsibility Scale involving five sub-scales: social welfare (e.g., helping others without getting paid for it); duty (e.g., worrying about finishing jobs); competence to be responsible (e.g., being good at helping people); sense of efficacy (e.g., having something to say about what happens to you); performance (e.g., being an active participant in the work of a group). Pre-post gains were also shown on a measure testing self-esteem in social situations. Additionally, students showed consistent changes in preferring democratic to authoritarian leadership and, at the end of the program, more often believed that they would be more active in their own communities upon returning home than they were before participating in the program. These results lack the benefit of a comparison group but they are strengthened by replication over three years and in two different sites.

The Evaluation of the Experiential Learning Project. Conrad and Hedin (1982) studied 30 participatory education programs which had a reputation for excellence. The authors explained that "It seemed prudent to study only the most well-conceptualized and established programs to

discover the effects, if any, of the practice of experiential education" (p. 59). Programs were of four major types: volunteer community service; career internship; community study/political action; and adventure education (patterned after Outward Bound). What all the programs had in common was that they were "educational programs offered as an integral part of the school curriculum, but taking place outside the conventional classroom, where students are in new roles featuring significant tasks with real consequences, and where the emphasis is on learning by doing with associated reflection" (p. 58). Of all evaluation studies discussed here, this one is perhaps the richest since it focused not only upon outcomes but also upon practice, and upon the characteristics of the experience as perceived by participants. Experiential learning (EL) groups were contrasted with conventional classroom (CC) groups (although not at each site) and evaluation instruments were administered in a pre-post design.

EL groups registered greater increases in global self-esteem than did CC groups but there were no significant differences on self-confidence in social situations. The most consistent gains were found among students in outdoor/adventure programs. The study suggested that this effect occurred because achievement was immediately obvious and reinforced. Other findings were:

- o EL groups registered greater increases in moral reasoning than did CC groups (using the Defining Issues Test as the means of assessing Kohlberg's "stages").
- o EL students showed greater increases in social and personal responsibility, with the strongest gains recorded in sense of competence and performance, followed by social efficacy and sense of duty.
- o EL students showed greater gains in positive attitudes toward adults than did CC students (who, in fact, showed decreases), along with gains on attitudes toward people in the community with which the EL groups had been interacting.

- o EL groups increased in their perception of being active in the community and in expression of their intent to remain so more than did CC groups.

- o EL groups showed greater increases in participating in career exploration activities and having information about career fields than did the CC groups, with students in programs offering career internships showing the greatest gains although other programs showed strong increases as well (despite the relative absence of an explicit focus on careers).

- o Subjective reports of "amount learned" were greater for EL than CC students.

- o On a "Problem-Solving Inventory," which, in part, assessed the ability and/or inclination of respondents to empathize with a target "other" in a story, EL groups showed greater gains than did CC groups. Students in programs that featured direct confrontation with interpersonal problems and formal reflection upon them showed the greatest gain.

An examination of particular program practices revealed that no one practice or set of practices was effective for all students. However, effects were demonstrated. The most powerful predictors of pre-post gains proved to be the specific characteristics of an individual's experience in a program. Among the more important, in order, were: the student's discussing experiences with teachers; doing things oneself instead of observing; working with adults who did not criticize either the student or the student's work; having adult responsibilities; developing personal relations with someone on site; having freedom to explore own interests; discussing experiences with family and friends; a sense of having made a contribution; carrying out a variety of tasks; and freedom to develop/use own ideas. As Conrad and Hedin point out it is useful to note the characteristics that did not account for gain as well. Among these were: having enough training to do the task and being given clear directions. Apparently, traditionally-structured adult-adolescent teaching relations are

not productive in participatory education situations. In relation to specific sets of outcomes, characteristics suggesting autonomy were more important in determining gains in personal than social domains. Social growth, on the other hand, was most influenced by interaction with adults (but not in a dependent student role).

Far less important than characteristics of the experience were student characteristics (age, grade point average, and socioeconomic status) and program features. Among the set of student characteristics, only age made a difference: older students benefited more than younger ones. Among program features, the single most important in explaining change was having an organized weekly seminar. Less important were length of the experience (semester better than a shorter time) and intensity (two or more hours, four or five days a week resulted in more positive effects than lesser involvement). The type of program did not affect gains.

The Better Education Through Application (BETA) Project. BETA was designed to develop standard high school courses that would allow students to apply their academic skills and knowledge in community service (Agnew, 1982). "Service-learning units" were incorporated into regular courses to occupy at least 10 percent of student time in a given course. An overall model was designed and implemented in service-learning units involving 18 courses. In a biology course, students in one section experienced service-learning; students in another section did not. Both sections took a multiple-choice examination on material covered in the nutrition unit. Students in the service-learning group scored significantly higher than the control group. Moreover, students' average final grades did not differ significantly, "indicating that overall achievement was not

affected by students' absences from the classroom" (Agnew, 1982, p. 46). Overall attitudes were positive toward the service-learning experience with 44 percent indicating that, given a choice, they would enroll in classes with service learning all of the time, 44 percent indicating they would do so about half of the time, and 11 percent indicating that they would rarely enroll in such a course. Similar results were reported for a service-learning experience in a course in American Government and Current Issues.

Experienced-Based Career Education (EBCE) Programs. EBCE is a secondary school career education program intended to achieve both academic and vocational outcomes by using public and private employers as teachers. The emphasis is upon career exploration, with students expected to spend school time in a series of workplaces. Career education, under the EBCE model, is to effect basic skills, entry-level occupational skills, and career decision-making skills. Good work habits, the desire to work, and the integration of work into personal values are also to be influenced.

Owens (1982) has summarized several evaluations of EBCE Programs. Among these was one conducted by Educational Testing Service (ETS). Using the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, survey questionnaires, and in-depth interviews of EBCE and control students, this evaluation concluded that: there was no particular gain or loss in reading and arithmetic skills from participation in EBCE; EBCE students knew more about and were interested in a greater number of career areas than were control students; EBCE students knew more about personal and academic abilities necessary for career-entry than did control students; EBCE students showed stronger feelings of control over career choices than did control students; EBCE

students' responses to interviewers' questions were briefer and more to the point than were those of control students; EBCE students were not more consistent than control students in choosing careers that were compatible with their self-knowledge.

In one study nearly 1000 students in 14 EBCE pilot sites were surveyed during the 1976-77 school year. While the nature of the evaluation designs varied from site to site, these general trends were apparent here:

- o ...EBCE students either maintained or showed improvement in basic academic skills and...they did as well as their counterparts in the regular classroom (Owens, 1982, p. 85).
- o EBCE students demonstrated positive changes in their attitudes toward school. Favorable increases in attitude toward self and others were found less often.
- o Students of EBCE programs engaged in more career-related activities than did non-EBCE students. Significant growth in career attitudes and career knowledge was detected at some EBCE sites.

Still other studies of EBCE outcomes address the issue of participatory education for special populations. In one study of gifted children given a one-semester opportunity to explore careers in the community, differences favoring participants over control students were reported in knowledge of community resources for problem solving, ability to generate alternative solutions to problems, and ability to describe occupational plans. On self-report measures, significant differences in the expected direction were reported in how values, government, and economy affect the world of work; basic skills necessary for vocations of interest; knowledge of the democratic process; finding and keeping a job; matching interests and abilities with potential careers; and knowing what to look for when thinking about a job.

Migrant senior high school students in Mission, Texas, also participated in an EBCE-like program. While out of classrooms for as much as a half-day, these students achieved the same level of performance on basic skills tests as did others. They gained in grade point averages as well. Attitudinally, they reported feelings of greater involvement, more choice, higher motivation, and more responsibility in EBCE than in regular school programs.

In a study of 100 CETA-eligible 11th and 12th graders enrolled in an EBCE-like program, 56 percent reported returning to their employer sites after regular school hours to help out either with or without pay, to continue work on their projects, or to seek advice from employers. Students in the program scored slightly higher than comparison group students on applied mathematics and language skills tests even though prior grade point averages in high school were lower than those of the comparison group. No significant differences were found on measures of sex equity, self-concept, oral communication, or attitudes toward work. Student participants themselves felt that program participation helped them most in:

- o getting things done and working smoothly with others;
- o learning about a variety of careers;
- o becoming aware of community resources;
- o accepting consequences of their own actions;
- o becoming self-motivated to learn;
- o becoming responsible for their own lives; and
- o improving communication skills (Owens, 1982, pp. 87-88).

Owens (1982) also reports a study of over 1,100 EBCE students in 24 states in which participants were asked about the nature of worksites that produce quality learning. According to the students, worksites that produce rich learning experiences have opportunities to learn job-specific skills; helpful and friendly co-workers; opportunities to form at least one close personal relationship with a co-worker by working closely with more than one person; tasks judged by outside consultants as having high or moderate levels of responsibility and challenge.

In a recent review of the literature on EBCE, Steinberg (in press) points out that consistent positive effects in obtaining information about the world of work and in valuing work tend to be short-lived; participation in special career education programs does not appear to have a positive impact on employment; and "EBCE has no significant impact, either positive or negative, on youngsters' school performance, self-esteem, self-concept, interpersonal skills, or attitudes toward responsibility" (p. 19). It seems highly likely that many of the latter outcomes did not arise from the nature of the work experience itself. Rather, they occurred because EBCE work placements involved little in the way of skill or responsibility. Digging holes, mopping, xeroxing, and the like--or watching adults do their jobs--were not atypical (Farrar, DeSanctis & Cowden, 1980).

The Greenberger and Steinberg Study of Work in "Naturally-Occurring" Part-Time Jobs. More than 65 percent of 16 and 17-years-olds work while attending high school. Contrary to the "blue ribbon" panel reports of the early 70s, work for American high school students has been commonplace for a long while. The bulk of these jobs are of the same sort as in

government-sponsored career education programs and job assurance programs. Most youth work in the food service industry. On-site observations of what students actually do indicate that "most part-time jobs entail highly-routinized, repetitive work with few opportunities for decision making or learning" (Greenberger, Steinberg, & Ruggiero, 1981). Again, contrary to the "blue-ribbon" panel reports, it seems unlikely that most work settings are any more autonomy-granting than are most school settings.

The Greenberger and Steinberg study, the most comprehensive of any yet done, suggests the following outcomes of part-time work:

- o employment of 15 or more hours weekly during the school year leads to declines in school attendance, time spent on homework, involvement in extracurricular activities, and reported school enjoyment;
- o employment of more than 15-to-20 hours a week leads, additionally, to lesser involvement in the family and in the peer group;
- o lowered school performance appears to be associated with the lessened involvement in school, particularly for students with marginal grades prior to employment;
- o work is associated with greater knowledge of the world of work but working longer hours does not lead to greater knowledge;
- o work that calls for a lot of nonroutined social interaction with strangers may enhance social cognitive development;
- o working seems to influence autonomy and self-direction for girls but not for boys but it may also lead to cynicism about the intrinsic value of hard work and to increased tolerance for illegal and unethical business practices; and
- o no effects on social responsibility.

More detailed accounts of findings from this project appear in Steinberg (1982) and Steinberg, Greenberger, Garduque, Ruggiero, and Vaux (1982).

Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project (YIEPP). YIEPP's principal objective was to examine the effect of assured work on attendance in school. In order to obtain and maintain a government-assured job, YIEPP students had either to stay in school or to return to school. Steinberg's (1982) review of literature on YIEPP programs suggests the following conclusions: work experience through such assured arrangements does not substantially affect attitudes, values, or psychosocial develop; YIEPP efforts are more successful in getting young people to return to school than in preventing them from dropping-out; and for people under the age of 21, such programs have no significant impact on subsequent employment or earnings (whereas they can be quite successful for older youth and even "high risk" older youth).

Author's Commentary on Literature

Research evaluating effective practices and outcomes of participatory education programs has increased markedly over the past decade with much of the best only recently finding its way into publication. Hamilton (1980) has provided far and away the best description of the state of the art of such evaluations. He proposes that four levels of measurement are entailed in answering the question, "How can the effects of experiential learning be measured?" These levels are:

> ...(1) Do participants say they have been affected? (2) Is there external evidence of effects? (3) Is there evidence that the program was responsible for the effects? (4) What about the program was responsible for the effects, that is, (a) was it the type of program (activity, sponsorship, control, leadership, purposes, participants) and/or (b) other program characteristics (duration, perceptions of participants, etc.) (Hamilton, 1980, p. 195)?

Participant Reports

Students tend to be positive and enthusiastic, especially when measured directly as opposed to reported by program designers. However, while important, these positive sentiments are not sufficient indicators of program effectiveness. First, it is not always the case that persons who have the most positive feelings are necessarily those who show the more interesting or impressive effects of participation when these feelings are measured by other means (Riecken, 1952 & Dentler, 1959). Second, global enthusiasm is more supportive of morale than of making hard decisions between alternative practices or competing programs (Hamilton, 1980).

Evidence from External Sources

Most program evaluations use pencil and paper instruments to assess changes in personal characteristics, attitudes, and knowledge. Conrad's evaluation of the National Leadership Conference program is a good example. The central questions in these evaluations have to do with the reliability and validity of the measures employed. Current published reports at this level of measurement do not often attend to the properties of their instruments. Similarly, such evaluation efforts often would have benefited from multiple measures of the same outcome obtained from not only students but other participants as well. However well evaluators do in meeting these criteria, the second-level evaluations are relatively weak because they do not evaluate whether changes in scores can be attributed to involvement in the participatory education program. To warrant such conclusions, comparison groups are required--groups matched on initial characteristics but participating in another, usually conventional, classroom program.

Attributing Effects to Programs

The central feature of level-three evaluations is the inclusion of comparison groups. The important methodological issues here have to do with the comparability of the two groups at the onset of the program. Comparability rests, in part, on selection bias; that is, if students choose to participate in a participatory education program rather than participating because they are assigned to it, they differ from the comparison group before the program begins. This is why Agnew's report on the BETA project is of special interest. In this project, sections of regularly constituted courses included special learning units; students had no option but to participate. That the results of such a study are positive and corroborate less elegant efforts, methodologically speaking, is an important step forward in the evaluation of participatory education programs. Of equal importance is the random selection of comparison groups, a point made by Steinberg in evaluating the work of Conrad and Hedin (1982). However, even when such rigorous evaluation demands are met, the problem remains that particular effects cannot be related to particular properties of the program. Simply comparing participants with nonparticipants--even with selection biases eliminated--will not provide practitioners and policy-setters much information about what aspects of the program "work" and for what students, and with what outcomes. Hamilton's fourth level speaks to this issue.

Attributing Particular Effects to Particular Properties of Programs

As Hamilton notes, this level of evaluation "is both the most useful and the most difficult to achieve" (p. 197). It is necessary not only to compare participants with nonparticipants but also to compare different

kinds of participation. Here, the Conrad and Hedin work is of special interest. That differential gains are associated with the presence of opportunities for analysis and reflection suggests the importance of this property in designing programs. That attitudes about social and personal responsibility and efficacy differ as a result of the opportunities provided for decision making and social interaction speaks to the need for clarifying objectives. Furthermore, that, overall, four different types of programs did not differ all that much in leading to positive developmental outcomes suggests that given exemplary programs in the first place and given the outcomes of interest, content is not so crucial as the conditions of teaching and learning.

Hamilton's conclusion is that "level three is as high as almost any evaluations have aimed and most fall even lower. The result is that there is little that can be said with assurance about the effects of experiential learning" (p. 198). What we know, then, in any sense that is scientifically convincing about participatory education is slim. What we are beginning to know is encouraging and the recent attention in published works to the kinds of issues that Hamilton raises is even more so. What of the other literary works that bear upon participatory learning?

Social- and cognitive-developmental theoretical efforts that link fundamental issues in human development with objectives and outcomes of participatory learning have only become available in the last 15 years. Most of the empirical research, and especially that of high scientific quality that bears on the theoretical underpinnings of participatory learning, has focused on the first decade of life and, particularly, on the first five years. Yet the up-shot of that research is quite favorable to

the general point of view espoused by advocates of participatory learning for secondary-school students for two reasons. First, effects of learning in early childhood are reversible; and, second, development throughout life is a matter of interactions between what a person brings to a situation (genetically and in terms of past experience) and the demands of current situations (as these are shaped by present and past, social and cultural forces). Participatory learning grew during a general intellectual climate of belief in the primacy of early experience. It is now being re-evaluated in a less-doctrinaire climate with reference to the issues of the primacy of early learning and the interaction of person and environment in shaping development. In short, secondary educators interested in participatory programs now operate in a far more favorable intellectual, if not social and political, climate than they did 15 years ago.

Issues

With respect to participatory education, three issues appear to be paramount: What is it? Should secondary schools be doing it? How can it be done well?

Clarification of the Concept of Participatory Education

From this brief survey of the state of the art, I conclude that the most fundamental issue facing practitioners is clarification of the concept of youth participation. This is important, not only for educators, but for communities, parents, and adolescents themselves. The absence of such clarification has led, in many instances, to a variety of sentiments that compel comment.

"Participation Programs are Noncognitive; Classroom Programs are Cognitive"

As we have seen, this is manifestly not the case, either in conceptual foundation or practice. The most basic aims of most programs are profound cognitive changes. The processes by which these aims are achieved are obviously, in part, cognitive, just as the processes involved in ordinary classroom learning are, in part, cognitive. Analysis and reflection are nearly everywhere seen as critical, perhaps the most critical components of effective programs. Unfortunately, program evaluators have not concentrated upon the kinds of cognitive outcomes expected--for example, changes in the quality of self and social understanding. At the least, neither standardized nor homemade measures of cognitive skills appear to be adversely affected; in fact, some studies show positive changes.

Youth Participation Amounts to Letting Students Leave the School Grounds to Experience the "Real World"

Effective youth participation programs amount to much more than that. They are programs that are planned and structured, usually with a blend of purposes in mind. Students' participation is guided by responsible teachers who do not only facilitate activities but carefully define and implement opportunities for stepping back, analyzing, and reflecting upon what has occurred. As we have seen in studies of Experience-Based Career Education, job assurance programs, and naturally occurring work experiences, placing young people in routinized roles with little opportunity for learning, reflection, and autonomy does not produce

the kinds of effects that appear in good service learning or adventure education programs.

We Can't Do Outward Bound in Kansas Because There Are No Mountains Here

As Gager (1982) has pointed out, inspiring descriptions of well-known programs sometimes lead those inexperienced in participatory education to focus upon externals rather than underlying purposes:

> Assumptions about adventure education...lead people to associate "doing adventure education" with climbing gear, mountain peaks, or islands off the coast of Maine. "Why, you can't do Outward Bound in Kansas, can you?" Maybe not, but you can do adventure education there, and everywhere else for that matter...If you understand the basic components of the experiential learning process. (p. 32)

Clarifying the concept of youth participation to all concerned constituencies involves sustained attention to its underlying properties as well as to its superficial ones. The issue is not the replication of the latter but the application of the former. Bringing New Math to Kansas classrooms is different from bringing in programs like Outward Bound. Youth participation programs, to be effective, invite and demand local adaptation rather than mere replication (Gager, 1982). One of the principal barriers to the incorporation of youth participation programs in secondary school districts, particularly large urban districts, may well be their particularity. They require substantial local (building-level) control--yet system-level support--to be effective and to endure. In shifting and drifting political and economic climates, it is doubtless easier to deal with the adoption or nonadoption of the relatively universal (e.g., a New Math curriculum and a set of accompanying textbooks and other materials) than with the particular (e.g., the "infusion model developed in the BETA programs, which involves the following steps: generating

service-learning ideas, contacting appropriate community service people, finding out where authority rests, constructing the learning experiences for students, developing working agreements with community agencies, evaluating the experience, solving logistical problems, and developing resources for expanding service opportunities" [Agnew, 1982, p. 45], and developing materials for teachers to help them with the practical tasks that must be accomplished to ensure effectiveness).

Effective participatory efforts are cognitive, as well as social and affective, in aim. They are structured programs with activities designed to achieve objectives rather than merely "experiences." Furthermore, they are locally based and locally designed. Among all of their attributes, these seem to be most central in arriving at a conceptualization of participatory education for a given school or school district, provided always that the most central feature--provision for individual student initiative and responsibility--is present.

The Role of Participatory Education in Secondary Schools

Should there be attempts to continue to integrate participatory education efforts into secondary school curricula (and into the programs of nonschool organizations)? Research alone cannot answer this question but it can contribute valuable information. Frequently, the underlying issues in answering this question in a given local situation are really a fear that participation will lead to the deterioration of basic language and numeric skills. However, available information suggests that such deterioration does not occur. If the underlying issues bear upon acquisition of facts, skills, and concepts within the domain covered by participatory learning, then it might be answered that--in the domains studied--participatory

education is sometimes more, sometimes equally, but rarely if ever, less effective. If the underlying issues in arriving at an answer to the question bear upon motivation to achieve in a more conventional learning situation, the effects appear to be equivocal. (There are not enough well-designed, follow-up studies but those that do exist at least suggest no reduction in such motivation.) If the underlying issues bear upon more active and wide-ranging and "mature" career-exploration, it appears that proponents of participatory education programs have a good case. If they bear upon overall increases in self-esteem, the results are unequivocal; if they bear upon increases in self-efficacy--in the feeling that the student can get things done--the results seem to be positive. If decisions bear upon the importance of acquiring some sense that groups can be effective in getting things done in our society, then the results appear to be even more positive.

While research can provide information of ever and ever better quality related to these "underlying issues," it cannot supply an answer to the question of whether personal and social development is a legitimate educational objective. If the answer to that question is not affirmative, then perhaps the only useful information above is that good participatory education programs are not harmful when judged in terms of conventional, symbolic outputs. If the answer to that question is affirmative, the information we do have is useful in suggesting that organized programs of participatory education can impact on important aspects of personal and social development--including cognitive development--in ways that conventional classroom programs do not.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are directed toward improving the quality of participatory education. There are a dozen of them, directed always by the existing literature (but only rarely supported by research that directly links particular outcomes with particular practices). Nonetheless these recommendations do reflect present knowledge and thus warrant attention.

1. During the planning, implementation, and evaluation of participatory education programs, it is important to clarify and prioritize objectives. Conventional programs of classroom-based learning do not often have the multiple objectives of participatory education; nor are they as subject to fate. Because participatory education programs are not totally based in the school, there is less direct control over the conditions of teaching and learning. Either may be enhanced or constrained by what suddenly and unexpectedly happens "out here."

Participatory education programs may also have objectives that complement conventional programs. There should be general objectives and individual objectives for participants. Often, there are task and project-related objectives as well. Owing to this mix and to changes in program activities in light of changes in opportunities, it is often difficult for constituencies to keep objectives clear. Especially important here are discrepancies between the views of those who "sell" the program and those who run it. One objective may well be to finish the play area in the park, but if the educational objectives are not kept in sight while attaining this goal, the program may not be very effective or, at least, perceived so.

2. Communicate priorities among objectives. It is important that all constituencies be reminded of the priorities among objectives. In most cases, such priorities will center on what the effort will do for students. Programs have been lost in communities where communications about them emphasize fun activities or surface outcomes rather than what adolescent participants are learning and how they are learning it. The legitimacy of even solid programs can be undermined when opinion leaders believe that participatory education involves only "letting young people out of school to do something good for the community."

3. Localize the plan. By now there are literally thousands of examples of available programs. There are also program models such as Experienced-Based Career Education, National Leadership Conference, Outward Bound, Fox Fire, and so forth. However, as Tyler (1982) has noted:

> Effective programs must be worked out at the local school level--where the students are, the teachers are, the parents are, and the out-of-school experiences will need to be. District administrators can encourage projects and furnish technical assistance where needed, but the local schools and their communities vary, so that a simple plan is not likely to work. (p. 27)

A program is not nested in the community, in general, but in a particular community. The best assurance that participatory education will work in a given community is the involvement of teachers and community members in the planning process (Cowens, 1982). Gager (1982) noted that the issue is one of adaptation rather than replication. A truly adaptive match or fit is one that not only uses local community resources but is based upon specific, localized understandings about how the effort complements conventional programs within the same school.

4. Provide adequate planning time. Agnew (1982) has suggested that inadequate planning time is one of the major obstacles to effective programming. When participatory programs are new to a school, small-scale pilot efforts are well worth the investment as they provide, along with existing written materials and other resources, a laboratory for revising initial plans and activities (Tyler, 1982). "After experimenting with the pilot projects, the large-scale efforts produced fewer failures" (Tyler, 1982, p. 28). Planning time must be scheduled carefully because of the multiple objectives of usual programs, the interdependencies among teachers and cooperating community members, and the newness of the effort for all the many constituencies involved. A lengthy planning and pilot period is also useful because it can provide an opportunity to interpet and reinterpet objectives to all the interested parties as they are clarified in the planning process.

5. Provide resources for teaching skills and knowledge to teachers. Inadequate resources for training teachers has been identified as another major obstacle to effective participatory education programs (Agnew, 1982; Owens, 1982). The teacher is a facilitator and coordinator in participatory programs. However, the skills that the teacher needs overlap only partly with those of conventional subject-matter instruction. While much of the content obviously involves subject-matter knowledge (as when the participatory experience serves as a laboratory adjunct to classroom activity), otner equally important "content" comes from what is happening in the course of the program and from how the student is processin, what is happening. Teachers are not all equally adept at integrating activities and the students' perceptions of their activities with the facts and

principles of the subject matter involved. This is especially so when community members have a share in the process. Assuring that teachers have adequate skills becomes especially important in that part of the program that calls for providing carefully structured opportunities for reflection and analysis of the experience since this appears to be critical for effective programs. Again, small-scale pilot efforts can be useful in providing a laboratory for teacher training, but only if appropriate technical assistance and consultation are provided as well.

The remaining recommendations have to do with effective attributes of participatory education programs as they bear on participants.

6. Participatory education programs ought to require opportunities for decision making, initiative, and responsibility. The theoretical and empirical basis for this assertion should by now be clear. Effective programs of participation involve "living" and not just "preparation for life." They involve challenge, risk, and personal and social responsibility for outcomes and their consequences. There are two levels of concern here: (a) student participation in determining the conditions of teaching and learning--that is, in planning, assessing individual progress, and evaluating the program; (b) the extent to which the programmed activities themselves provide the requisite opportunities for taking initiative and responsibility. If the program is in a planning/pilot phase, student involvement in decision making usefully and effectively may begin there. If the model is relatively set, student involvement in decision making may or may not mean student involvement in the setting of individual learning objectives. (Outward-Bound-type programs appear not to be structured in this direction; instead group appreciation for individual efforts and what

they mean to the individual and to the group are built into programs. Yet, the individual is challenged and applauded for individual effort.) In general, individualizing learning objectives and subsequent assessment of student progress should be seriously considered in structuring most participatory learning programs. Student participation in assessing progress and in evaluating the program ought to be guaranteed.

7. Participatory education programs ought to require the involvement of young people in serious working relationships with adults and peers. One of the roots of the participatory education movement is the widespread perception that adolescents are removed from side-by-side, meaningful mentor/apprenticeship relationships with adults. Less often remarked, but equally important, is the relative absence of opportunities to work (as opposed to play) with peers toward achieving some meaningful social end. Conventional classroom practices often discourage these outcomes while effective programs of participatory education are likely to encourage them. Theoretically, it appears that moderate discrepancies between the expectations and views of important others facilitate cognitive development, especially with respect to the sophistication of perspectives on interpersonal and intergroup relations, moral judgment and social convention. Empirically, outcome research suggests that a close working relationship with at least one adult produces not only more positive testimonials but higher gain scores on most criteria of interest thus far measured. Unfortunately, there has been little in the way of measuring the effects of working with peers at responsible tasks.

8. Participatory education programs should be designed to respond to some genuine need. This recommendation is directed toward those programs which involve community service. In commenting upon the BETA Project, Agnew (1982) notes that in order for service-learning experiences to be worthwhile for students and others, it is critical that the service "be a genuine one that students can recognize as meeting an important human need." Put simply, the point is that cosmetic, make-shift, or otherwise cooked-up activities provided neither the challenge that drives learning nor the opportunity to take pride in mastery and accomplishment. Some of the nil or counter-productive effects of work experience identified by Steinberg (in press) may well be related to the absence in most adolescent work situations of the challenges and rewards involved in identifying one's self with a pressing human problem and its solution.

9. Participatory education programs should be designed to have visible results. When examined in the context of what has been stated above, this recommendation may seem surprising and even paradoxical. Throughout, I have argued that too much focus on activities and outcomes can have negative results (as, for example, when visible outcomes detract from serious consideration of objectives for the learner). Here the point is a different one. When results of students' work are tangible and visible to students and all others involved, the opportunity to feel pride in mastery and accomplishment is intrinsic to the activity itself and to the student's participation in it. The rewards are not so likely to be experienced as remote benefactions of an impartial judge or arbiter but as a direct part of the process.

It is not always easy to identify activities that have promise of tangible and visible outcomes within one semester or school year. Nevertheless, it is important that tangible results occur before the term ends so that evaluation of what brought them about can be part of the process. Clarifying the positive and negative outcomes produced and how the efforts might better have been managed is a critical part of the participatory learning process. Here is another instance where small-scale pilot work can be useful. Highly motivated people often design efforts that are overly ambitious; pilot work can yield more realistic expectations and aspirations.

10. Participatory education programs should have a reflective component. The importance of including opportunities for reflection and critical analysis of participatory education programs has been noted several times. This point is underscored in the testimony of experienced practitioners as well as substantiated by outcome research: "The need to supplement activity with reflection in order to enhance its educational value is perhaps the most firmly grounded assertion that can be made about experiential learning" (Hamilton, 1980, p. 184). Why is reflection so important? Tyler (1982) answers this question in several ways. First, "experience in the 'real world' can be chaotic and confusing because events often occur rapidly and follow each other in an apparently disorganized fashion" (p. 26). Reflection provides an opportunity to put the pieces together, to discern patterns in what is happening, and, therefore, to improve the quality of observation the next time around. Second, reflection can promote the integration of participatory and conventional classroom learning by, for example, instigating the use of reference materials.

Students caught in the ebb and flow of events--especially in human service or civic roles--often focus on the immediate drama of agency clients' lives or upon the protagonists in a political conflict rather than going beyond dramatic events to dig into "the system." Tyler (1982) presents some useful questions that might guide reflection:

- o What is the function of the organization with which you worked?
- o What objectives does it appear to have?
- o What were the roles and the tasks of the different people in the organization?
- o How were these tasks viewed by those who carried them out?
- o What seemed to be the motives, attitudes, and social skills of the different persons you worked with and of the persons you served?
- o How were the persons treated who worked in the organization, and how were the clients treated? (p. 26)

11. Participatory education programs ought to involve "hands-on" experience or skill training. Evaluations of effective practices in ECBE and in other programs suggest that hands-on experience is part of effective programs. In settings that provide little or no learning, students report that they are given no tasks to do, or if they are given tasks, the are irrelevant. By itself, observing a work-site does not constitute a participatory education experience. Successful participatory education also involves explicit identification of skills that are involved in the tasks at hand although work on those skills may take place either on-site or off-site as is appropriate (e.g., "listening skills" in a human services situation). Systematic counseling about boring and repetitive tasks may be useful and even necessary (Owens, 1982). Learners enter participatory education sites with individual differences in skills and effective facilitation of their experiences involves recognition of such

differences. Formulating individualized learning objectives after the student's initial immersion in a setting would appear to be an effective strategy. Initial immersion in a responsible role provides not only an incentive to learn the skills necessary to get the job done but also the opportunity for the teacher and the student to assess, jointly, what skills are necessary to effective performance and what the student needs to do to improve his or her skills, and in what areas.

12. Planning the assessment of individual progress in participatory education programs should involve exploring the full range of assessment options. When the interest is in seeing whether students have mastered facts and concepts about the domain in question, assessing student progress may involve the use of "objective" or short-answer essay questions (e.g., as in a local government intern setting in which one of the learning objectives of interest is in learning "how the system works"). Such means may be particularly useful when the participatory education program is designed as a laboratory to supplement a more conventional course. Asking students to keep journals is a useful device in most participatory education programs, especially if students are required to record not only their experiences but also their reflections on those experiences. Group discussions can be helpful in much the same way but these depend more upon subjective impressions than do written records. The use of probing questions on tests or examinations--questions involving application, transfer, and generalization--may also be especially helpful. In working with college-student research interns, I have found oral examinations to be more helpful in most cases than written ones. Such examinations can be more flexibly tailored to an individual's own experience in the field-site and to individual learning objectives. Moreover, since

oral examinations do not involve writing time, they can cover more ground. Watkins and Corder's (1977) finding that EBCE participants responded to interview questions better than control students casts an interesting perspective on the desirability of including oral examination components. As Hamilton (1980) points out, determining whether such skills hold up when the basis for discussion is somewhat removed from the actual situation in which the student has participated provides a means of assessing transfer. Finally, competence in some actual or simulated task related to but at least superficially different from the participatory situation could provide for behavioral observation as a basis for assessment for learning and its transfer.

Hamilton introduces a useful perspective on the matter of assessment:

> Objectives cannot be stated at the level of specificity that is held to be desirable by Bloom and others concerned with instructional objectives for the classroom...They cannot be so specific, and the measurement of their attainment will remain problematic because the proportions of learners who can be expected to achieve identical objectives cannot be as high as in a controlled classroom situation. (pp. 190-191)

Participatory programs have multiple objectives and students enter them with different needs and skills. It is unlikely that assessment will be an effective aid to growth or learning unless both these characteristics are taken into account. Some degree of individualizing learning objectives a d, therefore, assessment would appear to be necessary for effective practice.

Summary

Effective participatory education programs are planned efforts designed to effect cognitive, social, and affective change. They are not authorized hookey and random walks through the "real world." While the

state of outcome research is not yet such as to permit unequivocal generalizations about effects, the research that exists is promising, especially when compared with research on effects of work experience per se. Positive effects include student, teacher, and community supervisor enthusiasm, feelings of self-efficacy and social efficacy, and increased knowledge about the domain in which the experience occurs. At the least, given sound programming, participatory education efforts do not undermine learning when judged in terms of conventional, symbolic outputs.

Assuring effective programs appears to depend most upon: clarifying and prioritizing objectives; communicating objectives and priorities to all constituencies concerned; adapting and localizing successful efforts of others rather than attempting to replicate them exactly; providing adequate time for planning and for pilot efforts; providing resources to impart knowledge and skills to school and community-based facilitators; providing opportunities for student decision making, initiative, and responsibility for follow-through; involving young people in serious working relationships with adults and peers; designing programs to respond to some genuine needs; mounting efforts that have visible results; including opportunities for serious analysis and reflection; providing "hands-on" experience and skill-training keyed to the needs and abilities of the group of students involved and the individuals in it; and assessing student progress flexibly in relation to multiple objectives and individual differences that students bring to the effort.

REFERENCES

Agnew, J. Better education through application. Synergist, 1982, 10(3), 45-48.

Borow, H. Career development. In J. F. Adams (Ed.), Understanding adolescence: Current developments in adolescent psychology. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1976.

Brannan, K., & Nathan, J. Being ripped off? Call a kid. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 4(3/4), 93-104.

Brown, B. F. The reform of secondary education: A report to the public and the profession. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Coleman, J. S. Youth: Transition to adulthood. Washington, DC: Office of Science and Technology, 1974.

Coleman, J. S. Differences between experiential and classroom learning. In M. T. Keeton (Ed.), Experiential learning: Rationale, characteristics, and assessment. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1977.

Conrad, D. Evaluation Report of the National Leadership Conference, June and July 1982.

Conrad, D., & Hedin, D. Citizenship education through participation. In Education for responsible citizenship: The report of the National Task Force on Citizenship Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Conrad, C., & Hedin, D. The impact of experiential education on adolescent development. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 4(3/4), 57-76.

Coser, R. L. The complexity of roles as a seedbed of individual autonomy. In L. A. Cosert (Ed.), The idea of social structure: Papers in honor of Robert Merton. New York: Harcourt, 1975.

Dentler, R. A. The young volunteers: An evaluation of three programs of the American Friends Service Committee. National Opinion Research Center, Report No. 71. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1959.

Dragastin, S. E., & Elder, G. H. Adolescence in the life cycle. New York: Wiley, 1975.

Farrar, E., DeSanctis, J., & Cowden, P. The walls within: Work, experience, and school reform. Cambridge: Huron Institute, 1980.

Gager, R. Experiential education: Strengthening the learning process. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 4(3/4), 31-39.

Greenberger, E., Steinberg, L., & Ruggiero, M. A job is a job is a job... Or is it? Behavioral observations in the adolescent workplace. Work and Occupations, 1982, 9, 79-96.

Hamilton, S. F. Experiential learning programs for youth. American Journal of Education, 1980, 88(2), 179-215.

Heyneman, S. P., & Thomas, D. R. A generalized matrix for research in youth participation. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Social Research Group, 1977.

Hill, J. P. Some perspectives on adolescence in American society. Washington, DC: Office of Child Development, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, May 1973.

Hill, J. P. Understanding early adolescence--A framework. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Early Adolescence, 1980.

Hill, J. P. Guest Editorial. Child Development, 1982, 53, 1409-1412. (a)

Hill, J. P. Secondary schools, socialization, and social development during early adolescence. In F. M. Newmann & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), Adolescent development and secondary schooling. Madison, WI: Center for Education Research, 1982. (b)

Hill, J. P., & Monks, F. J. (Eds.). Adolescence and youth in prospect. Guildford, Surrey, England: IPC Science and Technology Press, Lts., 1977.

Inhelder, P., & Piaget, J. The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence: An essay on the construction of formal operational structures. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Kohlberg, L. Continuities in childhood and adult moral development revisited. In P. B. Baltes & K. W. Schaie (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Personality and socialization. New York: Academic Press, 1973.

Lipsitz, J. S. Growing up forgotten. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1977.

Martin, J. H. National panel on high schools and adolescent education. Washington, DC: U. S. Office of Education, March 1974.

National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1972, 56(367).

National Commission on Resources for Youth. New roles for youth in the school and community. New York: Citation Press, 1974.

Newmann, F. W. Education for citizen action: Challenge for secondary curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1975.

Owens, T. R. Experience-based career education: Summary and implications of research and evaluation findings. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 4(3/4), 77-91.

Searcy, E. Work experience as preparation for adulthood. Washington, DC: George Washington University, Social Research Group, 1973.

Riecken, H. W. The volunteer work camp: A psychological evaluation. Cambridge MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1952.

Sharabany, R., Gershoni, R., & Hofman, J. E. Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship. Developmental Psychology, 1981, 17, 800-808.

Shoup, B. New worlds: Service learning in Kansas City, Kansas. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 4(3/4), 119-125.

Steinberg, L. Whither the workplace? The promises and problems of work experience for adolescents. In J. Simon & D. Stipek (Eds.), Exit age: Reconsidering compulsory education for adolescents. Studies in social science, education, and law. New York: Academic Press, in press.

Steinberg, L. Jumping off the work experience bandwagon. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1982, 11, 183-205.

Steinberg, L., Greenberger, E., Garduque, L., Ruggiero, M., & Vauz, A. Effects of working on adolescent development. Developmental Psychology, 1982, 18, 385-395.

Tyler, R. W. Education for participation: Implications for school curriculum and instruction. Child and Youth Services, 1982, 3(3/4), 21-29.

Watkins, R. W., & Corder, R. Student outcomes and participant opinions in experienced-based career education schools. Berkeley: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Weber, J. R., & Custer, C. Youth involvement. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1970.